



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,538	08/27/2003	Thomas Duane Kennedy	D-42237-02	5429

7590

05/03/2005

Rupert B. Hurley Jr.
Cryovac, Inc.
P.O. Box 464
Duncan, SC 29334

EXAMINER

TARAZANO, DONALD LAWRENCE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1773

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/649,538

Applicant(s)

KENNEDY ET AL.

Examiner

D. Lawrence Tarazano

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly envisaged by Eckstein et al. (6,437,064).

3. The applicants claim a package comprising a seal between two layers in which the first and second layers comprise a blend of (A) (e.g. polyethylene or ethylene /alpha-olefin copolymer) and (B) (e.g. homogeneous ethylene / alpha-olefin copolymer having a density from about 0.86 to 0.91 g/cc.)

4. The prior art teaches bags, which are heat sealed (column 1, lines 45); the films used to produce these structures comprise homogeneous ethylene/alpha-olefin copolymer having a preferred density in the range of 0.900 to 0.912 g/cc (column 5, lines 40-44) corresponding to the claimed material B.

5. The homogeneous polymer may be blended with additional low-density polyethylene materials (corresponding to A), (see claim 39).

Art Unit: 1773

6. This blend would be heat sealable based on its composition, and it is suggested that outer layers of this film structure can be heat sealed to close a bag structure (corresponding to the claimed package).

7. Regarding claim 20, while there is no requirement that the prior art materials have a different softening point, the examiner notes that it is highly improbable that the two resins would have the same melting point. Given the breadth of the applicants' temperature difference (1 to 100 deg C), and the variety of polymers suggested in the prior art, it is clear that resins meeting this requirement would clearly fall within the material suggested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eckstein et al. (6,437,064).

10. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have heat sealed the films set forth in claim 39 of the patent in order to produce a sealed structure suitable for packaging meat products.

11. Since resins typically have different softening points, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have blended two polymers having different softening points for the blend set forth in claim 39.

Response to Arguments

12. The examiner has reviewed the applicants' amendments and reasons for changing the language of the claims. The examiner thanks the applicants for clarifying which claims are pending in the application. The double patenting rejection has been overcome by canceling the claims in questions. The examiner notes that claims 19 and 20 are rejected under new grounds and the action is not made final.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Lawrence Tarazano whose telephone number is (571)-272-1515. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 6:00 (off every other Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on (571)-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D. Lawrence Tarazano

Application/Control Number: 10/649,538

Page 5

Art Unit: 1773

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1773

A handwritten signature or set of initials, possibly reading 'DW', enclosed within a curved, semi-circular line.